

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 1, 2000

LB 43, 921

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, did you use phraseology similar to what I just laid out to describe this committee amendment that you're offering?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Much to my regret, I believe I did.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why do you regret it?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Well, look what it's provoked.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What has it provoked?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: This colloquy.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And do you think the colloquy might bring enlightenment to our colleagues, or at least to one of the "colloquizes"?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: (Laugh) It certainly might.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now when we say "rendition", because I think when we have a technical bill like this it is good to get some things into the record, what is the difference between "rendition" and "entry" as envisioned by this amendment?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: We're restoring "rendition" as the language where it relates for petitions in error, and we're using the consistent terminology, "entry of judgment", as we did in LB 43 in the prior session. We're also using that in LB 921 in order promote consistency.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: To make sure that I'm getting it right, we promote the consistency by striking "entry" and inserting the word "rendition".

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, because, frankly, when we used entry of judgment last year in LB 43 we ought not to have.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Who is this "we" who made that mistake?